DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 022 396 FL 000 960

By-Stais, James, Ed.

PROCEEDINGS: ANNUAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE CONFERENCE AT NEW YORK UNIVERSITY (33RD, NOVEMBER 4, 1967).

New York Univ., N.Y. School of Education.
Pub Date 4 Nov 67
Note-54p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.24
Descriptors-*AUDIOLINGUAL METHODS, AUTOINSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS, COMPUTER ASSISTED INSTRUCTION, EDUCATIONAL TRENDS, EFFECTIVE TEACHING, INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT, INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION, *INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION, *LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, LANGUAGE LABORATORIES, LANGUAGE TEACHERS, MODERN LANGUAGES, *PROGRAMED INSTRUCTION, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, PROGRAM PLANNING

The theme of this conference, "New Directions in Foreign Language Teaching," is introduced by Theodore Buebener and is expanded in the five papers comprising this volume. The papers included are "New Directions in the Teaching of Foreign Languages--An Evaluation" by Peter M. Boyd-Bowman, "An Appraisal of Audio-Lingualism in Historical Perspective" by Elena Carullo, "New Directions in the Teaching of Common Western Languages--Programed Instruction" by Hilier Spokoini, "Instructional Television and Foreign Languages--An Evaluation" by Leo Bernardo, and "New Directions and the Human Values" by Rose Aquin. Some of the questions asked at the conference are also included with their answers. (AF)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROCEEDINGS

Thirty-third Annual Foreign Language Conference at New York University

November 4, 1967

FL 000 960

ED022396

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
School of Education
Division of Foreign Languages
and International Relations Education

PROCEEDINGS

Thirty-third Annual
Foreign Language Conference
at New York University

November 4, 1967

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
School of Education
Division of Foreign Languages
and International Relations Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Staff of the Division of Foreign Languages and International Relations Education, 1967-1968	iv
Foreword	v
Introduction	vi
Greetings from New York University	1
Theme of the Conference	4
New Directions in the Teaching of Foreign Languages: An Evaluation	6
An Appraisal of Audio-Lingualism in Historical Perspective	15
New Directions in the Teaching of Common Western Languages: Programmed Instruction	22
Instructional Television and Foreign Languages: An Evaluation	28
New Directions and the Human Values	32
Questions	38

STAFF OF THE DIVISION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS EDUCATION

1967-1968

Emilio L. Guerra, Ph.D., Head of the Division

Elvira Adorno, A.M.
Joseph Badi, A.M.
Anna E. Balakian, Ph.D.
Salvatore Corteselli, M.S.
S. Michael Gelber, Ph.D.
Louis C. Gerstein, Ph.D.
Jacob D. Godin, M.S.E.
Emanuel Green, M.H.L.
Eduard Y. Kutscher, A.M.
Gladys C. Lipton, Ed.M.
Ira Marienhoff, A.M.
Alexander Melamid, Ph.D.
Emma Menna, A.M.
Guy J. Nardo, Ph.D.
Alda M. Pizzinger, Ph.D.
David Rudavsky, Ph.D.
Irma L. Silberberg, Ph.D.
Maurice Silver, Ph.D.
James Stais, Ph.D.
Marvin Wasserman, A.M.
Nathan H. Winter, Ph.D.
Vera S. Zorn, A.M.

Miss Manuela Ronquillo, Secretary
Miss Catherine E. Singels, Secretary

FOREWORD

During the past thirty-three years we have been very fortunate indeed in having had the wholehearted cooperation of teachers and supervisors of foreign languages on all levels of instruction and of representatives of the leading professional organizations in planning the Annual Foreign Language Conference at New York University held on the first Saturday of November of each year. Whatever success has been achieved in this Conference each year should be ascribed to the fact that the Conference has been the result of the cooperative efforts of the profession at large working closely with the staff of the Division of Foreign Languages and International Relations Education.

In expressing our thanks to all those persons and organizations in the field of foreign language instruction that have been largely responsible for enabling us to make a contribution to our common cause, we should also like to reiterate that we are looking forward to many more years of fruitful cooperation between our staff and the teachers and supervisors of foreign languages serving in the front lines of educational endeavor who are indeed most knowledgeable about the needs of teachers and students of foreign languages on all instructional levels.

EMILIO L. GUERRA
Head, Division of
Foreign Languages
and International
Relations Education

INTRODUCTION

The Thirty-third Annual Foreign Language Conference was held under the supervision of the Division of Foreign Languages and International Relations Education of New York University at the Eisner and Lubin Auditorium, Loeb Student Center, Washington Square South, New York, N.Y.

The theme of the Conference was "New Directions in the Teaching of Foreign Languages—An Evaluation," keynoted by an address by Dr. Peter M. Boyd-Bowman, Professor of Hispanic Linguistics at the State University of New York at Buffalo. Following a discussion of the impact on foreign language teaching of programmed learning, educational television, and computer-assisted instruction, Professor Boyd-Bowman suggested that the major task lies ahead "... to combine the machine and the teacher into a coordinated program that will allow each to do that which he does best." In his concluding remarks, the speaker proposed several methods for innovative instruction.

The audience was welcomed to New York University by Vice Dean John C. Payne of the School of Education, who offered a few timely and provocative observations concerning the various functions of conferences such as ours and of their essential relevance to the total processes and problems of education.

Dr. Emilio L. Guerra, Head of the Division of Foreign Languages and International Relations Education, School of Education, New York University, served as Conference Chairman.

Dr. Theodore Huebener, Professor of Languages at Fairleigh Dickinson University, was the Conference Moderator and introduced the speakers.

The members of the discussion panel were:

Sister Rose Aquin, O.P., Associate Professor of Romance Languages, Dominican College of Blauvelt, Blauvelt, N.Y.

Leo Benardo, Director of Foreign Languages, Public Schools of the City of New York

Elena Carullo, President, Westchester Chapter, A.A.T.S.P., Ardsley High School, Ardsley, N.Y.

Hilier Spokoini, Vice-President and Editor of the Language Federation Bulletin (NYSFFLT), John Bowne High School, Flushing, N.Y.

The Conference Committee was composed of the following:

Anna E. Balakian
Dora S. Bashour
Leo Benardo
Brother Cornelius P. McDonnell
Brother Denis Murphy, F.M.S.
Brother Joseph A. Cussen
Brother Joseph Dougherty, F.S.C.
Brother R.D. Berryman, C.F.C.
Louis Chary
Nancy Frankfort
Ralph Ghetti
Jacob D. Godin
Emilio L. Guerra
Theodore Huebener
William Jassey
Gladys C. Lipton
Robert J. Ludwig
Rev. Howard A. McCaffrey, S.J.
Emma Menna
Jerome G. Mirsky
Silvio Muschera
Guy J. Nardo
Theodore Nuzzi
Alda M. Pizzinger
Sadie D. Riccardi
David Rudavsky
Martin H. Sabin
Loren W. Shores
Irma L. Silberberg
Maurice Silver
Sister Rose Aquin, O.P.
Hilier Spokoini
James Stais
Sidney L. Teitelbaum
Jacqueline Wahl
Marvin Wasserman

The following associations cooperated generously in the planning and preparations for this Conference:

American Association of Teachers of French
American Association of Teachers of German
American Association of Teachers of Hebrew
American Association of Teachers of Italian
American Association of Teachers of Slavic and Eastern European Languages
American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese
American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages
Association of Foreign Language Chairmen of New York

Council of Foreign Language Chairmen and
  Supervisors of Westchester Country
Foreign Language Association of Chairmen and
  Supervisors (Long Island)
Foreign Language Education Association
Modern Language Association of America
Modern Language Teachers' Council of the
  Archdiocese of New York
National Association of Professors of Hebrew
National Federation of Modern Language
  Teachers' Associations
New York Classical Club
New York State Federation of Foreign
  Language Teachers

James Stais
Editor of the
Proceedings

GREETINGS FROM NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

John C. Payne
Vice Dean, School of Education

I have, as you know, appeared several times before this Conference, in my role as greeter. I suppose it would be enough if I made some brief sign that all is well, that the latchstring is out, that you have our blessings, or a simple good morning in various vernaculars, and then sat down. Somehow, none of these possibilities seemed just right to me even though I do want to convey to you my continuing pleasure in, and gratitude for, and even more, my simple amazement at your persistent participation in these annual Saturday conferences. There's not even a compensating day off for this professional contribution, with its significant potential for the field. This little band of ever-renewing, dedicated persons participating in the 33d Annual Conference, some for the first time, some for almost the whole of its history, might take just a moment to recognize that tomorrow, November 5, would have been the eightieth birthday of the late Professor Henri Olinger, who founded this Conference and who stamped upon it a character that persists. He was a friend to so many of us that it seems especially appropriate to recall his memory at this moment. When he retired in 1953, his work was continued with similar enthusiasm and purpose by the late Dr. C. O. Arndt, and now by Dr. Guerra, whose association with the Department dates back into the early days of this conference. Recollections of these men need not make us feel old. They were never old in their outlooks nor in their concerns for your field. For me, the mere recollection of them is an inspiration.

This morning I want to take just a moment for some editorializing about your conferences from the point of view of a general administrator who has a tremendous interest in the teaching of foreign languages but no special competence in the area. We devote a great deal of time these days to the reexamination of the whole apparatus of professional education: from the role of the students to the role of the teachers, to the role of the teacher-scholars, to financial support, to our total function.

It seems to me that over the years conferences of this sort have been preoccupied and, properly so, with at least seven different areas of concern. Let me note them as I see them in my office. You have been concerned with (1) objectives and purposes; (2) teacher techniques; (3) teacher readiness and stimulation, including teacher-training; (4) pupil readiness; (5) factors affecting learning; (6) suitability of materials; and (7) organization of the total program.

What I am uncertain about is what is a rightful expectation for the fruit of such conferences as you hold with apparently such success? What in the total establishment do they do for us?

Is it pure stimulation for each participant in the generalized hope that each man will go away with new vision of personal possibilities for himself in his assigned spot or in his field? Is it essentially guidance to us, in a particular department and school, which we are expected to translate into programs involving more than any single person can do except as part of a planned and coordinated movement? Is it possibly intended to identify for the field what most urgently cries for research, for institutionalizing, or for some other kind of field action?

These questions certainly do not apply either more or less to foreign language conferences than to mathematics conferences. My questions are constructive, not critical in any pejorative sense; they are general, not specific. They address themselves to the institution of the departmental, or field, conference as such—and they imply that conferences, like every other aspect of our establishment, if you like, must justify themselves in this moment of introspection about our total approach to problems of education.

Your conferences have ordinarily been interesting sessions. They usually leave me with a general feeling of stimulation, with a tremendous sense of <u>esprit de corps</u> in being associated with men and women of such ability and seriousness of purpose as you have. If this were all, however, I suspect that you would not find it enough.

Perhaps in 1968, a session on conference purposes and the conference integration into our total effort would not be amiss. It is not a defensive stance we want, nor an offensive stance, but an inquirer's stance into how well the institution of the conference actually meshes with the rest of the apparatus.

And now may I turn to a final word in a more conventional role. We are pleased to have as the Conference Moderator so eminent an authority as Professor Huebener, whose association with the field and with New York University is so enduring and so respected. I congratulate you and ourselves for having captured him, once again, for this morning. We are fortunate, too, in having Professor Boyd-Bowman as our principal speaker. I will leave to others the specific introduction of these men. New York University is again delighted to be host on this occasion. Our very best to you for this morning and for a healthy, hard-working commitment as the Conference legacy. Thank you very much.

THEME OF THE CONFERENCE

Professor Theodore Huebener

The theme of the Conference this year is a broad one. We are called upon to discuss "New Directions in Foreign Language Teaching." Now, any direction implies a point of departure and a given goal. Undoubtedly, all language specialists start from the same place, but the question is whether they are heading toward the same goal.

I should group our major directions under five categories: organization, education, automation, evaluation, and "linguistification," a word I have just coined and will explain shortly. Organization implies vertical as well as horizontal direction, intensive as well as extensive. Extending downward is the rapidly expanding FLES; upward there is the Advanced Placement Program. Vertically, the new direction has introduced a number of new and exotic languages; many of these, such as Urdu, Swahili, and Tagalog, were unknown to us until recently, but thanks to the efforts of linguists such as Professor Boyd-Bowman they are becoming more widely taught and better understood. We shall be hearing some details concerning recent developments in this area from Dr. Boyd-Bowman.

We come now to the second category, education. All the newer pedagogical procedures, dialogues, pattern drills, and various other excercises using the audio-lingual approach assign primary importance to the spoken tongue and stress the utilitarian rather than the literary aspects of the language. The audio-lingual approach ties up directly with automation, our third category. The use of devices such as tapes, films, radio, and television and the acceptance of the language laboratory teaching machines, computers, and programmed instruction are all important factors in foreign language teaching today. To determine whether the newer devices and practices are leading to more effective instruction and learning brings us to the next area, that of evaluation. Various new tests have been devised, such as those of the MLA and the Pimsleur Test, which have helped to deal with the particularly troublesome problem of oral production.

Now we come to "linguistification." One of the most incisive influences on the philosophy and the psychology of foreign language learning has been that of the structural linguists. Their experience, discoveries, and theories have resulted in drastic changes in the principles and practices of language teaching. Within the last few years, an entirely new field, linguistics, has emerged as a powerful force in foreign language teaching.

These, then, are the new directions that foreign languages have embarked on. How effective they are, what weaknesses have appeared, what changes should and will be made will, we hope, come out in the discussions during this Conference.

NEW DIRECTIONS IN THE TEACHING OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES: AN EVALUATION

Professor Peter M. Boyd-Bowman

I must tell you at the outset that I lay no claim to being an expert in all phases and techniques of language teaching. While I have had considerable success with certain kinds of teaching, and have learned from experience certain things to do and things to avoid, I do not feel qualified to speak with authority about many of the other promising techniques that are being developed in our fast-moving profession.

Certain basic ideas occur to me which I would like to present for your consideration:

1. That with ever-increasing automation in all phases of life in our times no language teacher's time should be devoted to doing anything that a machine can do equally well.

2. That the task of learning a language is a highly complex one involving the mastery of several skills, with a considerable body of cultural insights and factual knowledge to serve as a frame of reference.

3. That while some of the phases of learning a foreign language are intellective in nature and should obviously be taught by a live instructor, other phases, those that are time consuming, repetitive, and require individual student responses, not only can but should be automated if the best use is to be made of the teacher's valuable time. Some of the techniques that have been tried in recent years to free the teacher from the burden of classroom routines on the one hand and the individual student from being lockstepped with his classmates on the other are programmed learning, computer programming, and educational television. About programmed learning I know not nearly enough to qualify as an expert. The obvious advantage of programs such as TEMAC is that each individual student can work at his own speed with printed and taped materials that lead him, step by step, to control of increasingly complex structures in the language he is learning. In theory, at least, failure is impossible, provided the program is

built with enough intermediate steps and enough illustrations and excercises. Through a systematic dialogue between taped voice and student response, the student progresses constantly while his efforts are either confirmed or corrected through seeing or hearing the correct response immediately after his own. The course materials are really quite inexpensive and theoretically, at least, programmed learning should be the ideal solution to language-learning problems, and all we language teachers would need to do would be to pick up where the programmed course leaves off. We could then devote our energies to discussions of literature, to lectures on history and culture, and to discussing the finer points of grammar, thought, or style. Unfortunately, programmed courses often fail to hold the average student's interest long enough to achieve success. Learning a language is not after all a question of mastering a body of factual information or acquiring the ability to reason logically. If it were, then I think that programmed learning would be truly the answer to our dreams. To learn a language is in fact to acquire a skill, and the only way to acquire a skill is through practice under conditions that approximate as closely as possible a live situation. Obviously one does not learn how to play tennis or golf by reading a book on the game, no matter how knowledgeable the author may be. One should be out on the tennis court or the golf course playing under actual conditions right from the start. Therefore it seems to me that any system of language teaching which completely replaces communication with other human beings by communication with a machine has a basic flaw in it. I personally have never met a person who claims to have learned even the basic mechanics of a language entirely from a machine. This may be due in part to the fact that the effectiveness of any programmed course is limited by the caliber and skill of the individual teachers who planned and prepared it. Planning and writing a programmed course is a very time-consuming and highly specialized occupation. Unfortunately the best language teachers are not always the best programmers and vice versa.

What I have said about simple programmed language courses, using taped voices and a manual or other device that exposes successive frames and correct answers,

holds true I believe of the computer-based programs that are now coming into vogue. Here the cost of communications equipment and of time spent in preparing the program tends to be extremely high. Many thousands of students would need to have used a certain program successfully before it could justify itself from an economic point of view. Perhaps the time will eventually come when the quality of these programs will be such that most schools and universities will find it economical and educationally sound to use the computerized approach for the vast majority of their language students. However, computerized language programs are still very much in their infancy, and I suspect that it will be some time before we as teachers can devote all our energies to the more intellectual aspects of our profession. This fall our department at the State University of New York at Buffalo is planning to participate in such experimentation by having one complete section of beginning German students receive all their instruction through stations where they will respond to a program fed in by computer from a distant campus. But even assuming that the program itself is well-constructed and manages to sustain the students' interest for a prolonged period of time, the cost of conducting such a program will probably never be attractive, and it may also prove logistically impractical to install enough of these costly stations to handle students by the hundreds. We will be watching the German experiment with great interest, however.

Educational television has had many adherents in recent years. It is obvious to everyone that here is a virtually untapped medium for educating vast segments of our population, and there are many who deplore the way this medium is virtually monopolized by commercial interests catering to the lowest common denominators in our society. Unfortunately, lecture or demonstration-type courses lend themselves to television much more readily than courses that attempt to develop individual skills. Feedback is a serious problem, one that even two-way television, with its period at the end of the lecture or demonstration earmarked for telephoned questions and answers, has not fully managed to solve. Hitherto, television programs of this sort have tended to be offered at undesirable times of day (often from six to seven weekday mornings!) and many students find it difficult or impossible to view the program regular-

ly enough to keep up. Nor can individual learning rates be allowed for, obviously. While a great advantage of educational television is that it can bring into the home or the classroom the experience and skill of a truly expert teacher, perhaps one of the best in the whole country, the drawbacks are the lack of feedback that I have already mentioned and the punishing demands made upon the time and energy of the teacher responsible for preparing each class for television. A thirty-minute program may take as much as a full day to prepare and rehearse, exclusive of the time put in by the technicians responsible for televising it. Moreover in many subjects obsolescence is a factor that may severely limit the useful life of a program in which so much money has already been invested.

In the case of basic language courses, it has long been my conviction that the optimum approach to the problem of saving the teacher's time is not to do away with live instruction altogether but to combine the machine and the teacher into a coordinated program that will allow each to do that which he does best. The tape recorder permits the student to practice on his own as often as necessary to achieve the desired control, while the live instructor reviews with the student the material he has sought to master and elaborates it further. It seems to me a fearful waste of the instructor's time to discuss grammatical constructions with students unless they already know how to use them. Surely one must first learn how to do something before one can profitably analyze why one is doing it. This sequence—practical mastery first, analysis and discussion later—is the normal sequence in the study of our native language, and it is surely best for other languages as well. I have on various occasions permitted able and ambitious students to master Spanish entirely on their own, without formal classwork, in order to progress more rapidly than they could if held back by the average class level. These students would drill an hour every day in the language laboratory with tapes that I made available to them, in addition to which I would schedule for them one or two hours a week of review drill with one of our native-speaking laboratory assistants who would be paid at the hourly rate for campus employment. In these drill sessions the students would normally work with their books closed while the native speaker would select his cues directly from the

text. The self-taught students would take the same taped oral examinations in the laboratory that I routinely administered to my regular students, and invariably their performance was among the highest of the entire class. Several years of such favorable experience have led me to believe that, for the able and highly motivated student at least, some degree of emancipation from the lockstep of classroom instruction in elementary language is not only feasible but highly desirable.

It was experience with students in Spanish that in 1963 led me to conduct a two-year experiment in which carefully selected undergraduates at a small college in western Michigan undertook to study certain languages for which enrollment would obviously never be sufficient to justify faculty appointments. These languages (Japanese, Chinese, Hindi, Swahili, Portuguese, and Persian) were all typically unavailable at liberal arts colleges and indeed at most universities also. Under contract with the United States Office of Education I was to combine existing taped course materials, native-speaking informants, and outside examiners into a self-instructional program so inexpensive, so simple to operate, that it could be duplicated on any campus in the United States. This program, which was called the NLP (Neglected Language Program), was to have a limited but realistic objective, that of laying a foundation of oral competence roughly equivalent to the first four semesters of formal instruction elsewhere. Students who acquired this basic competence were encouraged to pursue their study of the language either in graduate school or at one of the numerous language and area centers located throughout the country.

The program proved so successful that last year the New York State Education Department's Center for International Programs and Services was awarded a five-year grant from the Carnegie Foundation to help spread the self-instruction concept in non-Western languages among colleges and universities throughout the state. As a result, fifteen self-instructional language courses were established at eight public and private institutions in New York last year, while this fall the number of courses has increased to thirty offered at twelve different institutions. These are, in addition to the State University of New York at Buffalo and the State

University College at Buffalo, Fordham University, Colgate University, Skidmore College, Elmira College, the College of Mount Saint Vincent, and the State University Colleges at New Paltz, Oneonta, Geneseo, Fredonia, and Plattsburgh. The languages being offered self-instructionally at one or more of the above-mentioned institutions are Chinese, Japanese, Hindi, Swahili, Portuguese, Arabic, Tagalog, Vietnamese, and Hungarian, for all of which excellent audio-lingual texts and tapes are available commercially. Next year the Carnegie grant calls for the establishment of yet another fifteen new programs to bring the grand total to forty-five.

Self-instruction was the topic of my recent address at the annual conference of the New York Federation of Language Teachers at C. W. Post College. It is also fully described in a 1965 monograph entitled Self-Instruction in the Non-Western Languages: A Manual for Program Directors, of which I have a few copies with me here today. Since I understand from our kind host that the majority of delegates to this Conference are secondary school teachers whose interest in Afro-Asian languages is probably not very great, I shall say only that having seen the amazing results obtained self-instructionally by freshmen in college, I feel quite certain that similar opportunities could, at very little cost, be made available to talented, highly motivated students in some of our more enterprising high schools, especially in metropolitan areas like New York where both tutors and qualified examiners are readily available. If anyone is seriously interested in exploring this possibility further, I will be delighted to meet with him at the end of this session.

In the last part of this talk I would like to state some views regarding the proper use of language laboratories. As you have no doubt surmised from my remarks so far, I regard the tape recorder as the most important language-learning tool ever invented, one which if properly used can take most of the drudgery out of language teaching and raise the status of the teacher to a much nobler and more intellectually challenging plane. Yet there are still language teachers in this country (I encountered many at the four NDEA language institutes I directed) who seem actually afraid of the

tape recorder and resent it in much the same way as old-fashioned people no doubt resented the coming of the automobile at the turn of the century. There are other teachers who pay lip service to the value of tape recorders and of language laboratories but continue to teach their classes as if these tools were peripheral to the language-learning process instead of an integral, perhaps even the central part of it. This is particularly reflected in the continued heavy reliance on reading and writing tests to measure achievement in courses that purport to emphasize listening comprehension and speaking.

Pedagogically, of course, it makes little sense to test student progress in an audio-lingual course via a written examination since oral communication and writing ability are quite different skills. Yet this is exactly what some teachers are guilty of doing, often simply because they are unfamiliar with suitable techniques for testing oral skills. As a consequence, their students tend to put little or no effort into developing oral proficiency since it counts for so little in determining their grades.

If an audio-lingual course is to be really successful, the students must be rewarded for oral proficiency in a frequent and systematic manner. There are many commercially available, standardized tests for measuring listening comprehension and speaking, and the instructions for most of them are even available on tape. For a full description of these tests, as well as for detailed suggestions on how to make up one's own, I recommend very highly Rebecca Valette's excellent new handbook entitled Modern Language Testing (Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1967, $3.75). The remarkable effectiveness of laboratory quizzes in improving student attitudes toward attendance and participation in the language laboratory is amusingly described by the same author in the very first issue of FL Annals (American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, October 1967, pp. 45-48). Alas, many schools have a laboratory with listening stations only, which makes it impossible to use for group testing of speaking ability. For such situations I can recommend the following simple formula, which requires only that the teacher temporarily set up two portable tape recorders in his own office: From the unit or units to be covered on the

quiz the teacher preselects five dialogue sentences of medium length for echoing, five questions (also in the target language) to which the student must invent reasonable replies, and ten English sentences to be put into the target language. These twenty items, worth 5 percent each, are then recorded on tape by the teacher together with brief instructions and with pauses short enough to compel the student to react immediately to each cue. The resulting quiz, given on tape in the teacher's office, takes approximately five minutes to administer to each student individually on an appointment basis. While each student is responding to the taped cues, the teacher (1) keeps a running tally of the number of errors he hears, subtracts this from 100 to yield a percentage score, and (2) records all student responses consecutively on the second tape recorder as a permanent record of class performance available for future analysis. Scoring the quiz even as it is being administered saves the teacher the hours of time it would otherwise take to correct, say, twenty-five written examinations. While there are of course many more sophisticated quizzes that can be devised to test speaking ability, the simplicity and speed with which the type I have just described can be made up, administered, and graded makes it practical for even the most hardworking teacher to give routine oral quizzes at fairly frequent intervals. Personally I have found frequent quizzes of this kind most effective in ensuring that the students take speaking seriously and maintain a positive attitude toward their oral work both in the classroom and in the laboratory. It is no longer necessary to coerce the students into attending the laboratory. They will go voluntarily and, moreover, participate actively, since they know that both listening comprehension and speaking proficiency will count heavily in their grade for the course. Breaking the lockstep, or how can the really bright language student be challenged to progress at his own speed? Four years of experience have proved beyond any reasonable doubt that carefully chosen, highly motivated college students, working on their own with tape recorders and an untrained native informant, can compete with and often outperform students enrolled in regular classes elsewhere. This is true for all languages, common or "exotic," for which good audio-lingual drill materials exist on tape. But what about the really bright high school student? Could even he be permitted

to progress at his own speed in, say, Spanish or French, and possibly cover two years in one? Indeed he could and with minimum supervision. Here is how it could work at a high school willing to provide a few student-controlled stereo-tape recorders and a quiet place to use them:

1. Rearrange the typical Monday through Friday sequence so that all discussion of cultural material is presented on two of these days while the other three classes are devoted to developing language skills.

2. Successful applicants for independent study, all of whom should have scored high on the qualifying Modern Language Aptitude Test and be honor students besides (high I.Q., good study habits), would participate in the cultural discussions with the rest of the class, but on the other three days (and maybe in lieu of study hall as well) would work entirely on their own with the tapes and text for a college level course such as the MLA's Modern Spanish.

3. When such a student thinks he has mastered a particular unit, he would present himself for an oral quiz by the teacher to determine if he is ready to proceed to the next unit. When the teacher thinks the student has completely mastered all the material in a given unit, he notes the fact on a chart (perhaps recording a grade as well) and allows him to start work on the next unit. If the student's command of the material is in any way faulty or even hesitant, he is sent back for more independent practice. Such unit-by-unit testing may take the form of a "live" oral interview, or it may be prerecorded on tape and administered in the teacher's office as described earlier.

4. By permitting those who are able to do it to progress more rapidly on their own, the teacher can give more attention in class to those who really need it.

An Appraisal of Audio-Lingualism in Historical Perspective

Elena Carullo

I would like to address myself to the direction taken by audio-lingualism in recent years.

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 brought to the nation's attention the tremendous need for improved foreign language instruction in the American educational system. Because of the NDEA legislation and the Conant Report, The American High School Today, more schools have come to offer better instruction in more foreign languages to more students for longer periods of time.

The shift in emphasis from reading ability to communication brought about stress on competence in the use of the foreign language through the development of the four language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing, as well as an understanding of other peoples through the study of the foreign culture.

The shift in emphasis was aided by the availability of NDEA funds for research on foreign language learning, for the development of audio-lingually oriented materials, for training of teachers at institutes in the new approaches and in using the new materials, and for the purchase of new equipment and materials.

Publishing and recording companies were quick in bringing out many new and exciting materials: new textbooks, student record sets, tape recordings, pictures, slides, filmstrips, films. Some of these materials were well-organized, sequential, and well-correlated, but others were definitely substandard and put out in haste in order not to lose out on the market. Electronics companies developed tape recorders and language laboratory equipment.

Sputnik moved the Russian language into the limelight, and schools that had had a basic offering of French, Latin, and Spanish were encouraged to add Russian, German, and other languages.

With the increased attention of foreign language learning and the interest aroused by the new teaching methods and materials, the status of foreign language study increased, and more and more students enrolled in foreign language programs.

In order to develop the four language skills adequately, more time was needed than the two-year foreign language study programs of the 1940's and 1950's. Following Dr. Conant's recommendation that high schools offer students four years of language study, foreign language sequences of four, six, and ten years developed. A student beginning foreign language study in grade 9 was offered the opportunity of completing four years; one that began in grade 7, six years; and one beginning with a FLES program in grade 3, ten years. Naturally, the longer the sequence, the greater the probability of an adequate development of skills.

I believe that there have been significant modifications since the early days of audio-lingualism, and I think they can best be summarized by the words "knowledge" and "flexibility."

With the introduction of audio-lingualism came quite a bit of opposition, some of it from members of the profession who understood what was meant by "audio-lingualism" and sincerely did not consider it the best way of teaching a foreign language. Other opposition, however, came from members of the profession who did not understand what was meant by "audio-lingualism." Some of these teachers had been doing a good job for years and were not eager to become involved with a system they felt might try to change some of their basic beliefs about language instruction. Others felt that they were too old to get involved in something new. Some believed they knew better. Still others in this group, unfortunately, opposed it because it was "fashionable" to do so or because they had heard from "so and so" that audio-lingualism was foolish.

With the NDEA institutes, knowledge of the philosophy and practical applications of audio-lingualism spread not just to participants but also to curious teachers in the schools to which they returned. Some of the staunchest opponents soon realized that audio-lingualism was not a heresy but a possible answer to

the problems they had faced for years in trying to get their students to speak the language they were learning, and that, in reality, pattern practice was not new but dated back to the nineteenth century.

In-service education programs in school districts also helped tremendously in increasing the understanding of audio-lingualism.

Today, I think that audio-lingualism has been pretty widely accepted.

As teachers taught foreign languages in audio-lingually oriented programs, they learned from experience what some of the weaknesses of the early programs were and sought to correct these weaknesses. They moved away from a slavish adherence to teachers' editions and utilized their experience and creativity to improve instruction.

In 1965, the Modern Language Association proposed the term FSM (fundamental skills method) as a description of language instruction that attempts to teach listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing. The Modern Language Association indicated that it preferred FSM to MLA because MLA could be "misinterpreted as an approval of restriction to two of the four skills" and also because the term could "be confused with official approval of one set of teaching materials."(1)

Some teachers were shocked to find that their students could rattle off dialogue after diaologue in beautiful French or Spanish but couldn't tell the teacher in English what they were saying nor give the meaning of individual words. This brought about an emphasis on teaching for meaning and on the compilation of lexical lists at the completion of each unit of work.

The prereading period is no longer a fixed period of time. Readiness for the written word depends on the

---

1 Modern Language Association of America, September-October 1965, quoted in New Jersey State Department of Education, Secondary School Bulletin, Vol. 22, No. 7 (April 1966).

background, ability, and age of the students, and many students are ready to begin reading long before the end of the time period observed in the earlier days of audio-lingual teaching. Wise teachers initiate their students to reading as soon as they have mastered the basic sounds of the foreign language and have demonstrated an eagerness to read.

When interest in audio-lingually oriented teaching began to grow, it was generally believed that grammar was not taught if the teacher was giving an audio-lingual course. The very word "grammar" was for a time a word not many teachers cared to be heard saying. Today more and more people realize that grammar is <u>indeed</u> taught and that an audio-lingually oriented course, by its very nature, affords pupils a better opportunity for truly mastering the structures of the foreign language. The extent to which a student learns the structures and is able to recognize and use them in new contexts depends on the extent to which the teacher ensures that the students know and understand the generalizations involved and do not merely parrot a series of drills.

Reading and writing were neglected in the early days. Today teachers are working for the development of all four skills. One publisher has produced a reader and a workbook to help in the development of these skills. This same publisher and other publishers are revising their textbooks in line with the experience gained over the past few years.

With a greater understanding of audio-lingualism came improved techniques of testing. Teachers learned how to develop classroom tests that truly evaluated the audio-lingual skills which they had taught.

The New York State Regents Examinations in modern foreign languages reflected the trend to longer sequence by dropping the examination at the end of the second year and revising the format of the third-year examination so that the question types and point distribution would attempt to reflect new trends. In June 1967, the grading of question two of the Regents Examinations in modern foreign languages was changed somewhat in order to attempt to test the speaking skill as well as auditory comprehension.

In 1964, the Educational Testing Service of Princeton, N.J., made available the MLA Cooperative Foreign Language Tests. These tests, which are available for French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish, evaluate the student's achievement in each of the four skills: listening comprehension, speaking, reading, and writing. The tests are available for two different levels: one for one and one-half years of study and another for three and one-half years of study.

In 1967, Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., published the Pimsleur Proficiency Test in French, German, and Spanish. Like the MLA Cooperative Foreign Language Tests, the Pimsleur Proficiency Tests also can be used to evaluate all four skills.

Aptitude for foreign language study can be tested by such instruments as the Modern Language Aptitude Test by John B. Carroll and Stanley M. Sapon, published by the Psychological Corporation in 1955 for use in grades 9-12, and the Pimsleur Aptitude Battery by Paul Pimsleur, published by Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., for use at the end of grade 6 and in grades 7-12. In 1967, the Psychological Corporation published the Elementary Form of the Modern Language Aptitude Test for use in grades 3-6. In general, the results obtained from these aptitude tests can be used to ascertain a student's readiness for beginning foreign language study, to place the student in the group most appropriate to his ability, and to identify students with special talent for foreign language study and those with learning difficulties.

At the Annual Conference of the New York State Federation of Foreign Language Teachers, held three weeks ago at the Concord Hotel in the Catskills, a team of Canadian foreign language inspectors gave a demonstration of an oral examination that may very well change some of our foreign language-testing techniques.

In spite of the early skepticism about language laboratories, the language laboratory has become invaluable to the teacher for reinforcement of material learned in the classroom. The language laboratory did not go out of vogue but received wider acceptance. Whereas, in 1957, the United States Office of Education

reported forty-six language laboratories in the entire country, some individual schools have as many as two or three laboratories. Schools with space problems are adding mobile laboratories and equipping electronic classrooms. Language laboratory equipment has become more sophisticated; from the three to four program equipment, we have progressed to dial select-a-lesson systems—one particular system has up to twenty-four different foreign language programs in one installation, and some day there are going to be ninety-four, all merely at the turn of a dial.

Before proceeding to a discussion of some of the changes I should like to see in foreign language teaching in the future, I should like to state my position with regard to educational technology. Today educational technology has helped the teacher to become a creative leader of children and a skillful manipulator of teaching devices. Gone, indeed, are the comparatively "easier" days when the teacher would talk all day and use the same lesson plans year after year. I firmly believe that in order to do a good job, a teacher should make use of all the devices at his command, from spiritual to technological. I also believe in the importance of the interpersonal relationship between teacher and student. Consequently, it is my feeling that technological devices should be employed only where they can accomplish something the teacher cannot.

What direction will foreign language teaching take in the future—near and distant?

I should like to see wider acceptance of audio-lingualism among the colleges. In general, high schools have moved toward audio-lingualism and are now in the stages of refining it for their particular situations. Acceptance among the colleges, however, has not been widespread, and far too many institutions are clinging to the same methodology they were using ten and more years ago.

I should like to see a revision of current textbooks in line with proved results.

I should like to see longer sequences of foreign language study. Many more schools are now offering

four years of language study than were offering it in 1959, but we should progress to six and ten years.

I should like to see a greater number of schools develop "second track" programs for less able and non-college-bound students.

I should like to see culture integrated more fully into the total language program and materials developed that do not promote the notions of false stereotypes.

I should like to see the use of programmed language courses to meet the needs of individual students in cases where they are placed in classes with wide ranges of ability and background.

I should like to see the use of programmed language courses to meet the needs of individual students in cases where they are placed in classes with wide ranges of ability and background.

I am very enthusiastic about Dr. Boyd-Bowman's program with the State Education Department's Center for International Programs and Services. For some schools, it may mean that the foreign language offerings may be able to be extended to meet the requirements of the few students interested in studying a language not a part of the curriculum but neglected in the past because their number was never large enough to justify for the administration the setting up of a class.

Finally, I should like to see language laboratory programs fashioned after the science laboratory programs where a laboratory period is an addition to the regular class period and not part of it nor in place of it.

I hope that we shall be able to see some of these changes in the not too distant future.

NEW DIRECTIONS IN THE TEACHING OF COMMON WESTERN LANGUAGES: PROGRAMMED INSTRUCTION

Hilier Spokoini

There are many new factors that may be associated with the introduction of programmed and computer-assisted foreign language instruction. In this paper, I shall endeavor to describe just a few.

The first factor is underachievement. We all seem to agree, nowadays, on what a minimum goal should be in foreign languages for pupils headed for college; namely, a working control of understanding and speaking, a basic ability to read the target language without translation and to write simple sentences. And although the study of foreign languages is highly cumulative and, therefore, very much dependent on coordination—this coordination has not yet been achieved and we have, so far, failed to solve the problem of articulation existing among the various instructional levels. As a result, there is serious underachievement in foreign language learning. To lessen underachievement resulting from poor articulation, a very valuable tool is beginning to be widely used, namely programmed instruction in foreign languages.

A second factor is foreign languages for the non-college-bound pupil. Up to now, only pupils headed for college have been receiving foreign language instruction. But because we, in the United States of America, have vowed to eradicate racial tensions and their underlying social and economic causes, instruction in foreign languages no longer is considered as exclusively reserved for college-bound pupils but also as a compensatory program and an educational opportunity for the disadvantaged pupils. There is an increasing awareness of exposing pupils from our innercity schools to foreign language skills and culture. In March 1967, Mr. Paul Glaude, Chief of the Bureau of Foreign Language Education in Albany, wrote the following in a circular letter on Information Regarding New Developments in Foreign Language: "Attention to the needs of college-bound pupils who are studying foreign languages

in no way precludes attention to equally worthy pupils who have not been identified as college bound. In our time, it is completely unrealistic to consider that the need for basic foreign language skills and the need for cross-cultural understanding, which can be a product of foreign language instruction, are not felt by noncollege-bound pupils. The syllabus in Latin outlines a course in General Latin that may be studied with profit by noncollege-bound pupils. In modern foreign languages, comparable instruction can easily be provided by modification of course outlines and selection of appropriate materials to suit local conditions. Considerations of length of sequence and of beginning and terminal points of study are less important in the case of these pupils than in the case of college-bound pupils." The NYSFFLT also views with great favor the designation of foreign languages as required subjects in our state. As in English and social studies, there would be no Regents examination at the completion of this simplified foreign language course that would certainly greatly benefit and culturally enrich the so-called educationally deprived youngsters. Last March, at the Federation's Spring Workshop in Syracuse, the problem of the pupil with limitations in his own language that carry over into foreign language was discussed. And at our Long Island-New York City Regional Meeting, last April, a panel, including our distinguished Director, Mr. Leo Benardo, addressed itself to the question of foreign languages for the nonacademic pupil, and the same topic was again discussed at our Golden Anniversary Meeting at the Concord Hotel a few weeks ago. Could anything better be recommended than programmed foreign language instruction for the noncollege-bound pupils?

The third factor that may be associated with the introduction of programmed and computer-assisted foreign language instruction is the severe shortage of teachers who excel in the use of the languages. While it is true that smaller class registers are conducive to more effective teaching, a serious dearth of teachers prevents this ideal from materializing. Let's also not fail to take into consideration that pupil enrollment, both in the "academic" and "general" track, is expected to increase in the years to come, while, regrettably, the supply of adequately prepared teachers cannot be guaranteed. Therefore, computers are

most definitely in our futures! To cope with underachievement in foreign languages resulting from poor articulation, to help to bring about the urgent modification of foreign language course outlines for a hitherto untapped category of foreign language learners, and to alleviate the scarcity of competent teachers of foreign languages, administrators all over the country are turning to the still not fully explored educational possibilities of programmed and computer-assisted instruction.

As we all know, the Federal Government has virtually revitalized the field of foreign language instruction since the National Defense Education Act in 1958. On that occasion, the Congress stipulated that "new methods and instructional materials" should be used because the Senators and Representatives had no intention of wasting taxpayers' money on "traditional" methods. The vast federal financial aid to education continues but only if the provisions of equal educational opportunity are carried out. And since city public education is more than ever dependent on federal aid, equal educational opportunity in public education is becoming more and more a reality. Only recently, under Title III of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, have computer-based instructional systems been installed in New York City. Incidentally, these systems suit the special needs of the schools for giving more individual attention to pupils with widely varying levels of achievement.

Among the most important companies presently in the field of programmed and computer-assisted instruction are Behavioral Research Laboratories (BRL) in Palo Alto, Calif.; Science Research Associates or SRA in Chicago, a subsidiary of IBM; IBM itself; and General Learning Corporation, a joint venture by General Electric and Time and Life. This company is headed by former Commissioner Francis Keppel of the Office of Education in Washington. SRA is a publisher of elementary and secondary curriculum materials and the originator of a kind of programmed instruction through multilevel learning kits. It has announced for the fall of 1968, Spanish and French multilevel kits with tapes and is also experimenting with computer instruction programs. General Learning Corporation has currently undertaken a study financed by the United States Office

of Education to build a central computer installation capable of serving 100,000 students in perhaps 50 high schools and junior colleges within a 100-mile radius. This central computer system will not only control the presentation of information but also evaluate the students' responses. A similar study is being conducted by IBM.

Professor Brian Dutton of the University of London once said about programmed instruction: "If anything teaches, it is the interactivity of the learner and the program. The machine can help only by presenting the material in a lively way, using color slides, diagrams, etc., and through its most important function of maintaining control over the presentation of the teaching material in such a way that the student is forced to follow the program in the most logical manner, as designed by the programmer, and not, as in the average textbook, allowed to leap-frog through the pages and lose himself."

The ideal teaching situation is one teacher to each student. As the essence of humanity is diversity, each student learns in a particular way, at a particular rate, and in a particular length of time. However, the world population explosion has coincided with the spread of education throughout all nations and all levels of society, to such an extent that a reasonable education is now considered one of the basic rights of man. At the same time, the supply of teachers is being outstripped by the demand for teachers, and even if there were enough people willing to teach, there are not enough teacher-preparation facilities to cope with this ideal demand for such training. It is to provide a solution to this enormous problem that programmed instruction came almost providentially on the scene.

Why can programmed instruction be given to non-college-bound students? One significant fact that counts against some grammar-based "traditional" programmed language courses is that they share an interesting feature with other programs teaching factual material, namely they serve to measure I.Q. There appears to be a direct correlation between I.Q. and the time it takes to go through a factual program. However, this is not true of programs intended primarily to teach a skill. Here I.Q. does not seem to count as much as an

elusive quality that we will term "adaptability." Language is a skill, and the ability to speak and understand it does not necessarily have a major relationship to one's I.Q. The fact that in the traditional method those of a higher I.Q. range tend to do better than the rest may simply be due to the method itself, with its reliance on an appreciation of grammar and syntax. The more modern methods discard this system to a great extent and, in so doing, make language learning easier for the vast majority of people— including, of course, those of high I.Q.'s.

Now, briefly, here is how these methods work. Programmed instruction contains carefully sequenced teaching programs in which each step or frame is tested as soon as it is taught. There are two types of programs: the first type is linear. The student follows a linear sequence from step to step and is permitted to go at his own pace. This permits every student in the group to work up to the full measure of his ability. The second type of programming is branching. Here the student is permitted to skip certain materials in the program because of his high achievement in the material leading up to that point. If, on the other hand, achievement is low, he is required to continue through additional frames or is branched to remedial portions of the program. Programmed instruction materials have proved to be surprisingly effective in large group instruction. The structural progression of the programmed textbook rearranges the target language so that the rules that the learner can safely generalize are immediately apparent. It is branching programming that is used electronically in computer-assisted instruction.

In computer-assisted instruction, the student and the computer program may interact in the two following programs:

1. The individualized drill and practice programs supplement the regular teaching process. Here the computer provides regular review and practice on basic concepts and skills. the drill and practice work is particularly suitable for skill subjects, such as beginning work in a foreign language.

2. Tutorial programs help the student to understand a concept and to develop skill in using foreign language

grammar, for instance. As soon as the student shows clear understanding of a concept by successfully working a number of exercises, he is immediately introduced to a new concept and new exercises.

Both the drill and practice and tutorial systems are already in operation at the University of Illinois, Pennsylvania State University, University of California, and Stanford University.

Programmed and computer-assisted instruction are already functioning on an experimental basis and will no doubt have an increasing application throughout the country in the next few years.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bushnell, Donald D., and Allen, Dwight W. (eds.). The Computer in American Education. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967

Dutton, Brian (ed.). A Guide to Modern Language Teaching Methods. London: Cassel, 1965.

Goodlad, John I., O'Toole, John F., Jr., and Tyler, Louis L. Computers and Information Systems in Education. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966.

Loughary, John W. Man-Machine Systems in Education, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966.

Trow, William C. Teacher and Technology: New Designs for Learning. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, 1963.

Instructional Television and Foreign Languages: An Evaluation

Leo Benardo

The foreign language-teaching profession is approaching the use of television for direct instruction and for teacher-training almost as gingerly as it approached audio-lingual methodology, tapes and tape recorders, and language laboratories. The fears and apprehension expressed about television as a medium of instruction or even as enrichment have not been entirely unfounded. Initial efforts at instructional television for FLES or secondary school programs have too often shown:

1. Inadequate teacher models

2. Unexciting use of visuals

3. Haphazard continuity of instruction

4. Little or no correlation between school course and program content

5. Poor reception or faculty scheduling

Perhaps most damaging to the cause of instructional television may have been the position expressed by some school administrators that total language courses could be developed via television—particularly for elementary school pupils—when certified teachers were unavailable in the schools.

Having studied for some years now a fairly wide variety of methods and materials for foreign language teaching, I must conclude that the most exciting of techniques and the most elaborate of audio-visual devices are lost in the hands of an inadequately prepared teacher. This does not mean, however, that even our most brilliant practitioners do not need the support that can be provided by clear, native voices and by culturally authentic visuals. The video tape or the sound film can bring to the language program such support if it is carefully planned and integrated with the language course.

As a member of a panel of language specialists and educational broadcasters brought together by the National Center for School and College Television, I have had occasion to view samples of 94 foreign language telecourses (86 designed for students in elementary and secondary grades and eight for in-service teacher education). The panel was asked to judge the adequacy of television material in foreign language now in use throughout the country and to begin the development of guidelines for future television materials. Since July of this year, Professor Elton Hocking of Purdue and Professor Joseph Michel of the University of Texas and I have addressed ourselves to this question. Our general conclusions appear in the National School and College Television New Supplement Number 7, published less than a week ago.

I should like to share with you some of the observations and evaluations that resulted from this study and appear in the report:

1. Television is an excellent means for bringing the foreign culture into the classroom. The artificiality of the classroom situation is such that even our heroic attempts at building "cultural islands" are often forced and unsuccessful. Native scenes and native speakers give the student—and the teacher too—a more accurate and more exciting view of contemporary life.

2. The technical resources of television, particularly flashbacks, animation, and graphics, are not otherwise available to the classroom teacher and become extremely effective for presentation of new material or practice of previously introduced material.

3. The motivational force of good television upon students cannot be overestimated. It also gives the teacher a "broadened basis for intensive, systematic follow-up activities."

4. Good direct instruction presented on television can also serve as teacher-training material. Alternate methods of presentation, new types of drill, simple visuals used by the television teacher can help

the viewing teacher extend his repertoire of techniques.

5. Teacher-training television lectures tend to be less effective than unrehearsed classroom lessons with accompanying comment made by the language specialist.

6. There has been an unnecessary duplication of effort by local educational stations plagued as they are with low budgets, poorly trained technical personnel, insufficient numbers of native teachers who can project well on television, and inadequate resources for preparing a course outline that will fit properly into local courses of study or text materials. A national center which will help to make production suggestions, distribute useful film sequences filmed abroad, and serve as a clearing house for the sharing of information and materials is highly desirable.

The local picture in the New York metropolitan area may be somewhat brighter than it is in other parts of the country. Channel 25, the new Board of Education UHF station, has already gone into production with a new FLES series in French, to be telecast during the school year 1968-1969, supplemented by a radio series that will present supporting audio drills. A new bilingual (Spanish-English) series is planned for spring production on contemporary Latin American culture. A teacher-training television in-service course entitled "Challenges in Foreign Language Teaching" is on the air right now.

Where, you might ask, do we go from here?

Whether McLuhan's medium is a "message" or a "massage," television is here to stay. It seems to me that we have not made use of television programming already available to us—particularly the telecasts on Channel 47 which are produced entirely in Spanish. Would not a news broadcast, a weather report, or even a commercial in Spanish be effective for building auditory comprehension? A judicious selection of programs from this all-Spanish station would enrich our programs immeasurably.

Perhaps, too, there is a place for prestige public television stations such as Channel 13 to pre-

sent bilingual programs of interest to student of Spanish as a foreign language, to our many Spanish-speaking youngsters in the Greater New York area, and even to our ever-increasing number of Spanish-speaking adults.

And what about our colleagues in the publishing world, so many of whom have joined corporate forces with General Electric, Xerox, IBM, etc. This may be the time for them to plan text series that are accompanied not only by discs, audio tapes, flat visuals, and filmstrips but also by a carefully integrated series of video tapes or films.

It would be extremely short sighted to deny the enormous potential offered by instructional television. What it needs desperately is the cooperative hand of the foreign language teaching profession.

NEW DIRECTIONS AND THE HUMAN VALUES

Sister Rose Aquin, O.P.

Last year, we had installed in the Dominican College of Blauvelt, a new Sigma-Ampex language laboratory, with wall-to-wall carpeting, thirty fully-equipped student positions, and a console with nine possible simultaneous functions.

In the educational television studio, located at St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, Yonkers, one of our faculty members is employed full time.

Another faculty member has become our expert in the use of audio-visual media. In the summer of 1966, through an NDEA grant, she attended an Audio-Visual Institute at the State University at Oswego. In the summer of 1967, under Title VI, she attended a Faculty Development Institute in Educational Media at Teachers College, Columbia University.

Another member of the faculty is supervising the utilization of data processing in the Archidiocesan educational system. This includes test interpretation, scheduling, finances, curriculum development.

You see, good Pope John opened the windows, and now the nuns are flying all over the place. But, I tell you these things, not as an eleventh-hour appeal for the repeal of the Blaine Amendment, but to assure you that, in this wonderful world of automation, we are not living as strangers. We are exploring the field of cybernetics. We do recognize the place for and the benefits of the highly efficient mechanical and scientific autoinstructional devices. But we recognize them as tools, as aids, as devices that facilitate individualized drill and can aid in the teaching of arbitrary meanings, facts, and concepts.

Thus, when I read Professor Peter Boyd-Bowman's first basic idea: "That with ever-increasing automation in all phases of life in our times, no language teacher's time should be devoted to doing anything that a machine can do equally well," I underlined the words, <u>equally well</u>, for they are the most important words in the

statement. And Professor Boyd-Bowman intended them to be the most important, for he clearly states that any system of language teaching which completely replaces communication with other human beings by communication with a machine has a basic flaw in it. If we omit the words, "equally well," the statement will join the long line of the "Minds vs. Machines" statements that are covering the pages of our scholarly books and periodical literature.

The opening words of the preface of one of these books startle the reader with: "A specter is haunting the United States— the specter of automation— automation broadly defined as the displacement of human labor and brainpower by electronic and mechanical devices."(1) Another poses the question: "Is there an essential difference between a man and a machine?" "One type of answer claims for the man some psychological quality such as intelligence, consciousness, introspection, thought, free will, humor, love, correlation of speech and senses, or originality, which is said to be lacking in the machine."(2) "Of course, we all know that human beings have minds and that computing machines (at the moment) don't."(3)

Professor Stephen M. Corey of the University of Miami finds it necessary to distinguish between teaching and instruction. He defines instruction operationally as "the process whereby the environment of an individual is deliberately manipulated to enable him to learn to emit or engage in specified behaviors under specified conditions or as responses to specified situa-

1 Joseph S. Roucek, "Preface," Programmed Teaching, A Symposium on Automation in Education (New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1965), p. vii.

2 Michael Scriven, "The Mechanical Concept of Mind," Minds and Machines (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 31.

3 Alan Ross Anderson, "Introduction," Minds and Machines (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), p. 2.

tions."(4) He quotes Gage as saying: Teaching is a misleading generic term; it covers too much."(5) Professor Robert B. Nordberg, Marquette University, covers this "too much" in his article, "Teaching Machines—Six Dangers and One Advantage." The first danger is the attribution of abstract knowledge to a machine. He states: "If some pupil is so hopelessly unmechanized that he demands to know why this is or is not the right answer, the machine might (except that it can't) paraphrase Chaucer:

> I know not how these things may be;
> I give the answer given to me."(6)

This specification of behavior and the conditions under which it occurs imply a rigidity of objectives. It is Skinner's reinforcement theory of learning, the method by which he taught pigeons to play ping-pong. He reinforced or rewarded each correct move with a grain of corn. Then he arrived at the idea of teaching human beings step by step with the correct answer serving as reward. "No one knows," he contended, "what the human organism is capable of because no one has yet constructed the environment that will push human achievement to its limits." This pushing of human achievement to its limits may be called the science of learning, but can it be called the art of teaching? And this question leads us to a direction in language teaching that is ever ancient, ever new: the teacher.

---

4 Stephen M. Corey, "The Nature of Instruction," Programmed Instruction, Sixty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), p. 6.

---

5 Professor N. L. Gage, "Theories of Teaching," Theories of Learning and Instruction, Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), chap. XI.

---

6 Professor Robert B. Nordberg, "Teaching Machines—Six Dangers and One Advantage," Programmed Teaching—A Symposium of Automation in Education (New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1965), pp. 1-6.

Only a good teacher can be the master of this art. And what is a good teacher but a well-programmed human being who has the additional virtue of being multiply branched; that full man who is endowed with an intellect and free will and heart; that interdisciplinary scholar with his capacity for creating and combining. For teaching is essentially the confrontation of two intelligences, the dual mission of giving and receiving. It makes all the difference in the world when a teacher is smiling at me, looking at me, encouraging me—not an image on the television screen, not in gears and pulleys of a machine.

Those of us who witnessed the demonstration of the New Canadian Speaking Test at the NYSFFLT Conference noticed the charm that Renée Taillefer showered on the students she was testing, and how often Roy Schatz called the attention of the audience to this charm. "You can't afford to let up on the charm," he said, "if you want the test to be effective." Some give this as an advantage of the machine: it never loses its patience with the students.

At another panel, I heard lovely Dr. da Silva, Hofstra University, refer to her own language learning as falling in love. First, it was French; then, Spanish: "And I fell in love a second time," she said, "this time to stay." Those words found an echo in my own soul, as they must in yours, for we are teachers of language today because we fell in love with one or several of them. This love leads to mastery of the language. This love is infectious. It begets love in our students. This love is the source of the dynamic or evolving movement characteristic of the truly human, for what is human is never structured, static, or finished like a machine. To be human is to be in motion, in evolvement, in transcendence, or going beyond what is structured. My humanity, my intelligence as a language teacher can increase and deepen and expand, for I am not objectified; I am not thing-like. I am not structured to stultify, hamper, and kill the spirit—my own spirit and that of my students—for what is structured is necessarily constraining.

Professor Donald G. Fink, in his Computers and the Human Mind, states: "Of all the natural endowments of man none is more highly prized or more fiercely de-

fended than his gift of superior intelligence. Today, when such deep concern is centered on the intelligent machinery of computer science, the older, simpler superstitions—that man might some day be overcome by his own creations—are giving way to a modern version of an ancient superstition."(7)

Is there an intellectual revolution in the making? Can the machines of computation possibly exert effects on society like those of the machines of power that brought on the Industrial Revolution? The answer is "yes" if we as teachers are robots and the students whom we are teaching are robots. But if we admit that the art of teaching or the teaching act involves the life of feeling, sensitivity, personality, humor, religious dynamism, the teacher as a man, as a full man, then we can never afford to forget that the product of industry is a machine; the product of education is a human being. The true teaching act is a human thing.

In the Educational Forum, XXX, No. 1(November 1965), p. 94, Roland Keen asks the question, "What Is the Teaching Act?" and answers it:

> The Scientist had said
> What is the Teaching Act?
> Skeptical, he had doubted that any such act
> existed distinguishable from any other act
> of human communication.
> Perplexed, I asked my wife
> To recall the Act of her
> most respected high school teacher,
> and to explain this to me.

---

7 Donald G. Fink, "The Many Faces of Intelligence," Computers and the Human Mind, An Introduction to Artificial Intelligence (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1966), pp. 205-6.

Far more sensitive than I,
Because she is a far better teacher,
my wife replied:
"It is a 'telling,' but not of words alone.
I am thinking of Miss Pemberton.
Miss Bess loved us—
And wanted to show us
All the good and beautiful things she knew.
And there it is—
All the elements of the Teaching Act:
Love for youth . . .
An appreciation of the good and beautiful . . .
Dedication: a communication
beyond mere words . . .
To be combined in a myriad different ways,
ways with the myriad aspects
of each unique teaching
personality—so that the Gestalt
is more than the mere sum of the elements.
The true Teaching Act is a fragile
and human thing, O Scientist.
And so very rare.

QUESTIONS

Space limitations permit only a few of the interesting questions that were asked during the Conference.

To Professor Boyd-Bowman:

Question: Will you please tell us about the Bull Charts?

Answer: You refer to William Bull's chart, "A Visual Grammar of Spanish." This is an unusual presentation of grammar which exists only for Spanish. Developed at the University of California by Professor William Bull, it is one that has been used extremely effectively for students to conceptualize the vexing problems of Spanish grammar for a number of years. It is not nearly as well known as it should be. Many of us in this audience who teach Spanish are missing out on a remarkable teaching aid which is not very expensive, in the long run, since it contains almost 500 charts and can be used at all levels of instruction. I have used them at all levels myself and made effective use of them at the NDEA Spanish Institute which I directed. There is a manual that accompanies the charts, but many of them are self-explanatory in that they are contrastive. They contrast on the minimal situations, for example, the use of the indicative versus the subjunctive, traditionally one of the most difficult problems in Spanish. These are very attractive charts, well done, some of them culturally situated, which lend themselves not only to grammatical explanations, but also in advanced conversation classes to distribution among the students for oral compositions that they present to the remainder of the class after one or two minutes of prepa-

ration. If you are unfamiliar with these charts and are interested in securing them for your schools, they may be ordered from the Regents of the University of California at U.C.L.A. They are called William Bull's "A Visual Grammar of Spanish," and a complete set of the charts and accompanying manual is about $85.

To Mrs. Lipton:

Question: Have advances been made in the FLES Program, and can we define what the pupil learns in FLES for the benefit of the junior high school teacher?

Answer: The answer is yes to both parts of your question. Indeed, advances have been made in the FLES Program, particularly in New York City, where we are celebrating ten years of growth in FLES, from four schools in 1957 to 140 schools today. The second part of your question, making certain that junior high schools know what is covered in previous training on the FLES level, is extremely important, both for information as well as articulation. Generally, a FLES pupil who completes a three- or four-year sequence learns approximately one half of Level One, as we know it on the secondary level. However, it must be remembered that not all the skills receive equal attention. The FLES Program emphasizes listening and speaking skills, and the reading and writing of those structures and vocabulary that have been mastered audio-lingually. I shall suggest several ways in which the junior high school teacher might learn about the language competence of the FLES pupil. (1) The teacher should examine the FLES course of study and become acquainted with the structures and vocabulary covered in the program.

(2) There should be a program of inter-visitation so that the junior high school teacher would visit the FLES classes and, conversely, the FLES teacher would visit the junior high school classes to see the scope of the foreign language program on the upper levels. (3) There should be an interchange of tests and textual materials so that the junior high school teacher may understand the achievement levels of FLES pupils.

To Mr. Benardo:

Question: Will the city-wide two-year language examination contain a question on culture or civilization from now on?

Answer: No. I am hoping that the city-wide Level Two Examination will be removed at some date when we can persuade superintendents to see it our way.

Question: Why is the ALM not in the curriculum bulletin? How do the majority of teachers feel about ALM? Is there resentment against it?

Answer: The ALM text series is listed as an approved series in our approved list of textbooks. Any school in New York City that wishes to use ALM is perfectly free to do so. Our experience has been that schools vary. Some teachers and chairmen love ALM and continue to use it. Others would not touch it with a ten-foot pole. Each has a right to do what he sees fit in the ALM text series anyway.

Question: When are we going to have chairmen of foreign languages in the junior high schools? The present setup is that assistant principals are in charge of many subject areas.

Answer: We have eight licensed chairmen now in junior high schools. Those schools are functioning magnificently as a result of licensed leadership. There is now a list of chairmen who passed a rigorous examination and are awaiting appointment. We have not yet sold the Board of Education on having licensed supervision in every junior and senior high school. We will continue to press for it, and I urge you to write and speak as often as you can so that the Board members are aware of the pressing need in the junior high schools.

Question: There is an acute shortage of qualified foreign language teachers. Why then does the New York City school administation not allow people with a Ph.D. degree to teach in public schools?

Answer: That is not true. A person who has a Ph.D. degree but does not meet the education requirements (which are now being watered somewhat) still may not teach. That is true, but the Ph.D. does not keep him from teaching. What keeps him from teaching may be a number of methods courses he may not have. I hope that we, in New York City, may become enlightened as we go ahead and see to it that an accumulation of education courses will not ipso facto make an able teacher. As of now, however, we still have that requirement. By the way, there is no acute shortage of language teachers in New York City. This is not true. As a matter of fact, we have now had a good number of teachers with language licenses, particularly Spanish, who are not teaching Spanish. So that shortage is a fantasy. I am hoping that we can put to work all those who have language teaching licenses.

Question: Can French television programs, shown in Quebec and Montreal, be used on educational television?

Answer: I wish they would be. As a matter of fact, there are a number of French programs which are simple enough to be understood by those who have had no more than a couple of years of foreign language instruction in French. But our television stations are so geared to the garbage that they are currently presenting that nobody who is enterprising and interested enough is able to put some of these programs on. I have written to Channel 13 about this. I believe that the audience for programs in Spanish, French, Italian, and German, and even Hebrew as well, is very high. Although they need not offer hours and hours, an occasional program of this kind would be of enormous benefit to the community.

To Professor Huebener:

Question: Should not college teachers who are teaching basic courses be exposed to methods courses and NDEA institutes?

Answer: Yes. As I said years ago, the further down you go in the schools, the better the teacher; the further up you go, the worse the teaching gets.

To Mr. Spokoini:

Question: To what extent do you feel complete accuracy should be stressed as opposed to successful but inaccurately worded communication?

Answer: By all means communication. I do not care about accuracy, but sometimes I do not see any communication at all!

To Mrs. Carullo:

Question: Which group in Canada gave the new oral test you mentioned?

Answer: It was the foreign language inspectors of the Canadian Government, associated with the Board of Education in Ontario, Canada.

Question: Have you found resistance to giving MLA Tests because of the amount of teacher time required in correcting them?

Answer: Well, I can only speak from my own experience. We have given the MLA Cooperative Tests, and the teachers are very happy to do this because they want to have the results in order to know how their students show up against other students in other parts of the country.

To Dr. Huebener:

Question: Since you favor a foreign language requirement in the schools, do you feel that all students can be scheduled in the same course, or do you advise a track system with high, average, and modified courses?

Answer: Well, my own stand is that all students should get the same course, and that we should provide for the linguistically gifted students as we already do in honors courses or in special classes. The track system is feasible in the larger system, but is practically impossible in the smaller system.

To Mr. Benardo:

Answer: May I make one comment on that. You know, we have been saying this about

requiring foreign languages for years, but we say it to each other. The people we must sell are not foreign language teachers at all, but the parents and the community. We have not yet reached the parents on the importance of languages and their place in the curriculum. More and more communities are dictating curriculum. If this is the case, good or bad, it would seem to me that our talk must be directed to the community, or directly to parents. Perhaps we should use the television screen to talk to parents about the place of foreign languages. Talking among ourselves about requiring foreign languages will get us nowhere. People think we have a vested interest and pay no attention.

To Professor Boyd-Bowman:

Question: The sequence for learning one's mother tongue is hardly a valid argument for teaching a second language in the same manner. Would Professor Boyd-Bowman care to comment on this?

Answer: It is indeed perfectly true that a person does not learn a second language in the same way as he does his first, because he has the interference of his own language to contend with when it comes to grammar. At what point should grammar be formally discussed, before or after you teach the student, and how? My contention is that it is more effective to teach the student how to manipulate, how to use a type of structure, and then to draw his attention afterwards to the principles involved.

Question: If, as you appear to indicate, language learning is primarily the development of a skill, with performance gaining primacy over understanding, how can you justify elementary courses in language as legitimate college level offerings. Is the pragmatic approach an acceptable one for a liberal arts curriculum?

Answer: I did not say that. I meant to say that the initial stages of language learning, the learning of the four skills themselves, may take one year or even two years for a reasonable working command of the language. But after that, they lead to literature, to culture, and to the intellectually worthwhile phases of study.

To Mr. Benardo:

Question: In allowing a bright, capable, and interested student to do two years of French or Spanish in one, the reason is, presumably, to break the lockstep of the classroom and to enable the gifted student to reach more quickly the point where he can do advanced work. How do we know that it would be so used? Would there not be a number of students eager to polish off their language requirements so as to have more time for advanced work in mathematics, chemistry, etc.? Consequently, would not our more advanced classes thus be deprived of some excellent students?

Answer: I am basically opposed to acceleration in foreign languages in junior and senior high schools. That is not the place to race through languages. What do we mean by "doing two years in one"? What do "two years" mean? What does "one year" mean? We are

dealing with skills, and difficult skills indeed. One does not race through those skills, and there is much to be gained in spending a lot of time learning them. Therefore, I am against a two-year sequence in one, unless this is a high school program for seniors who will then move directly into college without a gap. Before that level I am for as long and continuous a program as possible. But I come back to the community; they are not sold on it. They say, "Let them complete their Third-Level Regents and go on to other areas." "They do not need any more," I hear from parent after parent. And the parents are having a lot to say about what will be in the curriculum of tomorrow.